



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,226	04/02/2004	Carolus De Bie	55505.156	3084
66405	7550	08/06/2008		
AGFA			EXAMINER	
c/o KEATING & BENNETT, LLP			FACTOL, NICHOLAS C	
1800 Alexander Bell Drive				
SUITE 200			ART UNIT	
Reston, VA 20191			2625	
			2625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			08/06/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			ELECTRONIC	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JKEATING@KBIPLAW.COM  
uspto@kbiplaw.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/817,226

**Applicant(s)**

BIE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Nicholas C. Pachol

**Art Unit**

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/02/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 04/10/08, in regards to the use of Hansen for claim 1 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "automatically determines which (intermediate) results can be reused") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

2. Applicant's arguments, see Pages 10 and 11 with respect to the prior art of Giles, filed 04/10/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 102(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hansen (US 6,421,575) in view of Higgins (US 5,835,627).

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: There is a left parenthesis with no corresponding right parenthesis in paragraph 77 on page 17.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hensen (US 6,411,314) in view of Higgins (US 5,835,627).

Regarding Claim 1, Hansen teaches a job control system (Column 2, lines 31-32) for controlling a job in a document processing system in which processing system a number of tasks is performed in a workflow (Column 2, lines 32-46), the job control system comprising an input source with a user interface for enabling a user to define and change a set of parameters selected from the group of first parameters for said workflow and second parameters within said workflow (Column 9, lines 3-22), wherein the job control system comprises:

-an identifier to identify and mark dependencies of results of said job to parameters (Column 10, lines 22-28), wherein said results are selected from the group of intermediate results of said job and final results of said job (Column 10, lines 28-39), and wherein said parameters are selected from the group of parameters for said workflow, parameters within said workflow, and parameters for individual task processors in a production plan defining processing of said job (Column 10, lines 40-56),

a verifier (Column 18, lines 57-62) to verify, during job execution, a change in a particular parameter out of said parameters (Column 18, lines 62-67).

Hansen does not teach a verifier to determine if (a) a particular result out of said results and obtained before said change in said particular parameter is independent of said particular parameter, or (b) if an effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result is within a given limit; so that said particular result is still useable despite said change in said particular parameter; and

storing still useable results on memory.

However, Higgins does teach the verifier to determine if (a) a particular result out of said results and obtained before said change in said particular parameter is independent of said particular parameter (Column 23, lines 4-9), or (b) if an effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result is within a given limit; so that said particular result is still useable despite said change in said particular parameter (Column 23, lines 4-58); and

- storing still useable results on memory (Column 10, lines 8-16).

Hensen and Higgins are combinable because they with the process of printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hensen with the teachings of Higgins to yield maximum satisfaction of an image (Column 2, lines 49-67).

Regarding Claim 2, Hensen further teaches wherein said results include a specific result provided by a specific task processor (Column 6, lines 39-56) and

Art Unit: 2625

wherein said identifier forms part of said specific task processor (Column 6, lines 39-56).

Regarding Claim 5, Hensen further teaches further comprising a controller for changing a job ticket for processing a particular job by said document processing system after said change in said particular parameter (Column 6, lines 31-47), wherein said changing said job ticket is for using said stored still useable results, and for automatically resubmitting said particular job to said document processing system (Column 12, lines 35-40).

Regarding Claim 8, Hensen further teaches further comprising a display device to display to a user said useable results (Column 2, lines 32-49).

Regarding Claim 9, Hensen further teaches wherein said display device is for displaying said dependencies to parameters of said useable results (Column 18, lines 22-39, since the operator is performing the task, then it must be displayed to the operator).

Regarding Claim 10, Hensen teaches a method (Column 2, lines 50-51) for controlling a job in a document processing system in which processing system a number of tasks is performed in a workflow (Column 2, lines 51-60), characterized in that the method comprises:

-identifying and marking dependencies of results of said job to parameters (Column 10, lines 22-28), wherein said results are selected from the group of intermediate results of said job and final results of said job (Column 10, lines 28-39), and wherein said parameters are selected from the group of parameters for said workflow, parameters within said workflow, and parameters for individual task processors in a production plan defining processing of said job (Column 10, lines 40-56);

-verifying, during job execution, a change in a particular parameter out of said parameters (Column 18, lines 62-67).

Hensen does not teach verifying and determining if (a) a particular result out of said results and obtained before said change in said particular parameter is independent of said particular parameter, or (b) if an effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result is within a given limit; so that said particular result is still useable despite said change in said particular parameter; and

-storing still useable results.

However, Higgins does teach the verifier to determine if (a) a particular result out of said results and obtained before said change in said particular parameter is independent of said particular parameter (Column 23, lines 4-9), or (b) if an effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result is within a given limit; so that said particular result is still useable despite said change in said particular parameter (Column 23, lines 4-58); and

- storing still useable results on memory (Column 10, lines 8-16).

Hensen and Higgins are combinable because they with the process of printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hensen with the teachings of Higgins to yield maximum satisfaction of an image (Column 2, lines 49-67).

Regarding Claim 11, Hensen further teaches further comprising:

-changing a job ticket for processing a particular job by said document processing system after said change in said particular parameter, wherein said changing said job ticket is for using said stored still useable results (Column 12, lines 35-40);

-automatically resubmitting said particular job to said document processing system (Column 11, lines 37-44).

Regarding Claim 12, in light of the method in claim 10, Hensen further teaches a computer program stored on a computer readable medium comprising computer program code (Column 8, lines 58-61) adapted to perform the method according to claim 10 when said program is run on a computer (Column 12, lines 57-65).

Regarding Claim 13, in light of the method in claim 11, Hensen further teaches a computer program stored on a computer readable medium comprising computer program code (Column 8, lines 58-61) adapted to perform the method according to claim 10 when said program is run on a computer (Column 12, lines 57-65).



Regarding Claim 14, in light of the method in claim 10, Hensen further teaches a computer readable medium comprising program code (Column 8, lines 58-61, where the computer program must be stored on computer readable medium) to perform the method according to claim 10 when said program is run on a computer (Column 12, lines 57-65).

Regarding Claim 15, in light of the method in claim 11, Hensen further teaches a computer readable medium comprising program code (Column 8, lines 58-61, where the computer program must be stored on computer readable medium) to perform the method according to claim 11 when said program is run on a computer (Column 12, lines 57-65).

3. Claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hensen (US 6,411,314) in view of Higgins (US 5,835,627) further in view of Shakespeare (US 6,421,575).

Regarding Claim 3, Hensen in view of Higgins does not teach wherein said verifier includes:

- a calculator for calculating said effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result;
- a comparator for comparing said effect to said given limit.

However, Shakespeare does teach wherein said verifier includes:

- a calculator for calculating said effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result (Column 6, lines 55-60);

- a comparator for comparing said effect to said given limit (Figure 3, element 106 and Column 5, lines 45-48).

Hensen in view of Higgins and Shakespeare are combinable because they all deal with the process of printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hensen in view of Higgins with Shakespeare to have a controller that tolerates errors well and performs well with errors (Shakespeare: Column 2, lines 30-33).

Regarding Claim 4, Hensen in view of Higgins does not teach wherein said verifier includes:

- an estimator for estimating said effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result;

- a comparator for comparing said effect to said given limit.

However, Shakespeare does teach wherein said verifier includes:

- an estimator for estimating said effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result (Column 10, lines 12-28, where the sampling is a form of estimating);

-a comparator for comparing said effect to said given limit (Figure 3, element 106 and Column 5, lines 45-48).

Hensen in view of Higgins and Shakespeare are combinable because they all deal with the process of printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hensen in view of Higgins with Shakespeare to have a controller that tolerates errors well and performs well with errors (Shakespeare: Column 2, lines 30-33).

Regarding Claim 6, Hensen further teaches further comprising a controller for changing a job ticket for processing a particular job by said document processing system after said change in said particular parameter (Column 6, lines 31-47), wherein said changing said job ticket is for using said stored still useable results, and for automatically resubmitting said particular job to said document processing system (Column 12, lines 35-40).

Regarding Claim 7, Hensen further teaches further comprising a controller for changing a job ticket for processing a particular job by said document processing system after said change in said particular parameter (Column 6, lines 31-47), wherein said changing said job ticket is for using said stored still useable results, and for automatically resubmitting said particular job to said document processing system (Column 12, lines 35-40).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thr, 8:00 a.m.- 4:00 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625